UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,573	06/03/2005	Frank William Wallace	SN134 PCT 1	4536	
	7590 . 08/15/200 NG CORPORATION O	EXAMINER			
2200 W. SALZ		LOEWE, ROBERT S			
P.O. BOX 994 MIDLAND, MI 48686-0994			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				1709	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/15/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents.admin@dowcorning.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/537,573	WALLACE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert Loewe	1709			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versility to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Ju</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 4-10 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the fidal drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/3/02	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 4-10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Traver et al. (US Pat. 4,600,436).

Traver et al. teaches a process for the preparation of an emulsion of an organo-functional polysiloxane comprising mechanically emulsifying a silanol-functional polysiloxane in water in the absence of any basic or acidic catalyst (4:44-45) for silanol polycondensation, adding an organofunctional silane of the formula X-A-Si(R)_n(OR')_{3-n}, where X represents an organic functional group, A represents a divalent organic linkage, each R represents a hydrocarbyl or substituted hydrocarbyl radical; each R' represents hydrogen or an alkyl or acyl group; and n = 0, 1, or 2 (5:55-62), to the aqueous phase of the resulting emulsion and reacting the 'OR' groups of the organofunctional silane with the silanol groups of the polysiloxane to form the organo-

Art Unit: 1709

functional polysiloxane (8:55-9:5). Traver et al. further teaches that the silanol-functional polysiloxane can be emulsified in the presence of a non-ionic surfactant (5:63-6:2). Thus, Traver et al. anticipates all the limitations of instant claims 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Traver et al. (US Pat. 4,600,436) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Schirosi et al. (WO 2002/42360).

Traver et al. teaches a process for the preparation of an emulsion of an organo-functional polysiloxane as set forth above. Traver et al. does not teach that the silanol-functional polysiloxane, at least one surfactant, and water are continuously fed to a high shear mixer in such proportions as to form a viscous oil in water emulsion which is continuously withdrawn from the

Art Unit: 1709

mixer and is diluted before addition of the organofunctional silane/alkoxy silane. However, Schirosi et al. does explicitly teach this limitation (paragraphs 20, 22, and 35). Traver et al. and Schirosi et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely silicone oil-in-water emulsions. At the time of invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to employ the oil-in-water compositions as taught by Traver et al. in the continuous process as taught by Schirosi et al. and would have been motivated to do so Schirosi et al. teaches that the polysiloxane fluids with terminal silanol groups can be further reacted in a chain extension reaction (examples 3 and 4). Schirosi et al. further teaches that one such chain extension reaction involves reaction of a silanol-terminated polysiloxane with an alkoxysilane (page 13, lines 28-29).

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 270-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571) 272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/537,573 Page 5

Art Unit: 1709

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RSL 7-July-2007

MARK EASHOO, PH.D. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

03/Aug/07